



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,595	01/31/2002	Harry Michael Siegel	01-C-055 (STM101-01055)	3416
7590	12/28/2004		EXAMINER JONES, DAVID B	
Lisa K. Jorgenson STMICROELECTRONICS, INC. 1310 Electronics Drive Carrollton, TX 75006			ART UNIT 3725	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TEG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,595

Applicant(s)

Siegel et al.

Examiner

David B. Jones

Art Unit

3725

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

12162004

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmer in view of Bakermans. The tool of Zimmer (Fig. 4) teaches what is considered to be a stamping tool that is capable of "imprinting" a deposit of deformable material 110. Hence Zimmer teaches the claimed invention excepting means for aligning the stamp at a position with respect to a hole in the workpiece. Bakermans teaches (col. 3, lines 46-62) the use of alignment pins 24 to align a stamping tool with respect to a workpiece 2 that has alignment holes 4 therein and to within ".001 inches or even less". It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention with the references of Zimmer and Bakermans before him to have provided the stamping tool and substrate of Zimmer alignment pins and holes so as to accurately guide the tool to the desired location on the workpiece. Regarding claim 2, Bakermans teaches that the pins can guide with a tolerance of .001 or less. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of circuit making would have found it obvious to make the tolerance of the pins to the hole to any desired parameter depending on the

Art Unit: 3725

preciseness of the workpiece being made, such a provision being an obvious choice of tooling design.

3. Claims 3-12 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. Claims 13-22 are allowed.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to David B. Jones whose telephone number is (703) 308-1887.

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

In the event that the Applicant (s) wishes to communicate via Fax number for Group 3700 is (703) 872-9306.

wahp

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David B. Jones", with a stylized, flowing script.

DAVID B. JONES
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3725